ПОЛИТИКА УПРАВЛЕНИЯ

этнокультурным разнообразием в Беларуси, Молдове и Украине: между советским наследием и европейскими стандартами

Европейский гуманитарный университет

Вильнюс
2014

УДК 323.15(476+477+478.9)
ББК 66.3(4Беи:4Укр:4Мол)
П50

Рекомендовано:
Научным советом ЕГУ (протокол № 53-35 от 4.03.2014 г.)

Авторский коллектив:
Беспамятных Николай, Василевич Анна, Осипов Александр, Прина Федерика, Пушкин Игорь

Рецензенты:
Нелли Бекус, PhD in Sociology, Research Associate, College of Humanities, University of Exeter;
Виктор Степаненко, кандидат социологических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института социологии НАН Украины (Киев)

Н. Беспамятных [и др.]
П50 **Политика управления этнокультурным разнообразием в Беларуси, Молдове и Украине: между советским наследием и европейскими стандартами.** – Вильнюс : ЕГУ, 2014. – 300 с.

ISBN 978-9955-773-73-3.

Коллективная монография посвящена роли советского идеологического и институционального наследия в управлении этнокультурным многообразием в Беларуси, Молдове и Украине (рассматриваемых как «большое Пограничье» между Европейским Союзом и Россией) и характеру взаимодействия этого наследия с подходами к защите меньшинств, предлагаемыми европейскими организациями (ЕС, Советом Европы и ОБСЕ). Этнокультурная политика в данной работе определяется как те компоненты правового регулирования и публичной политики, функциональность которых непосредственно обусловлена этнической неоднородностью населения. Предлагаемый анализ носит междисциплинарный характер, совмещающий подходы юриспруденции, политической науки и социологии. Сравнительно-юридический анализ нормативной базы этнокультурной политики в трех странах и сравнение этой базы с нормами и подходами, развиваемыми европейскими организациями, сочетается с рассмотрением политических институтов (с точки зрения неоинституционалистской перспективы в качестве устойчивых практик), определяющих контуры и содержание «управления разнообразием».

УДК 323.15(476+477+478.9)
ББК 66.3(4Беи:4Укр:4Мол)

Издание осуществлено в рамках проекта «Социальные трансформации в Пограничье – Беларусь, Украина, Молдова» при поддержке Корпорации Карнеги (Нью-Йорк)

ISBN 978-9955-773-73-3

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ВВЕДЕНИЕ

Эта книга посвящена тому, что в обыденном языке именуется «управлением межнациональными отношениями» или, по идущей от советского времени традиции, «национальной политикой». Здесь и ниже мы будем использовать нейтральные и менее нагруженные ассоциациями понятия «этнокультурная политика» или «политика управления этнокультурным разнообразием». Объект нашего исследования – современная этнокультурная политика в «большом Пограничье» – Беларуси, Молдове и Украине. Предмет изучения – взаимосвязи и конфликты между разными способами концептуализации и институционализации этой политики.

В настоящее время большинство современных государств и обществ так или иначе (разными способами, прямо или косвенно) признают свою неоднородность в этническом, языковом, культурном и других отношениях. Все больше стран постепенно отходит от того, чтобы воспринимать это разнообразие только как источник проблем и как временное нежелательное состояние; напротив, многообразие оценивается как норма и как общезначимая ценность.

Признание важности этнокультурного разнообразия влечет за собой выработку и применение правил и принципов, в соответствии с которыми оно может поддерживаться как часть организованной социальной жизни. Поэтому мы уже можем говорить о политике разнообразия или об «управлении многообразием»[1]. Здесь мы рассматриваем политику в значении «policies», как публичное управление или, другими словами, выработку «правил игры» и их про-

[1] Здесь и ниже слова «разнообразие» и «многообразие» мы используем как синонимы.

ведение в жизнь, а не столкновение позиций и интересов для получения доступа к властным ресурсам.

Практически все страны Европы и Северной Америки в тех или иных формах – в законодательстве, официальных заявлениях и практических решениях – признают важность политики разнообразия. Более того, основные приемлемые и желательные подходы к управлению разнообразием закреплены в международном праве – универсальных и региональных договорах, декларациях и рекомендациях. Наименование, границы, цели, задачи, содержание и характер этой политики определяются в разных случаях по-разному в зависимости от демографической ситуации, состояния общественных институтов, политического режима, интеллектуальных традиций и многих других обстоятельств.

Беларусь, Молдову и Украину можно назвать Пограничьем в географическом, историческом и социально-политическом смыслах, рассматривая их как условное большое пространство между, с одной стороны, консолидированной Европой, которая представлена в первую очередь ресурсами Европейского Союза, с другой стороны, советскими институтами и Российской Федерацией, все более явно и по сути позиционирующей себя как реинкарнация СССР.

Три страны Пограничья отличаются друг от друга размерами, историческим опытом, составом населения, политической и экономической ситуацией, но для нас важны три объединяющие их обстоятельства. Во-первых, они являются непосредственными соседями Европейского Союза и, хотя не имеют пока шансов стать кандидатами в члены ЕС, оказываются под сильным экономическим и политическим влиянием этой организации или, шире, европейских институтов. Во-вторых, регион подвергается разнообразному и неоднозначному воздействию со стороны Российской Федерации. В-третьих, все три страны в недавнем прошлом были частями Советского Союза, и можно ожидать, что общее наследие в той или иной степени определяет текущую ситуацию и тенденции развития. Здесь нас интересует взаимодействие первого и третьего из названных выше факторов, и в первую очередь идеологическое и институциональное наследие Советского Союза в политике управления этнокультурным многообразием и взаимодействие этого наследия с подходами, предлагаемыми европейскими организациями.

СССР, изначально определяя себя как многонациональное государство, на протяжении всей своей истории формировал и совершенствовал весьма сложную по задачам и компоновке политику управления разнообразием. Было бы грубым искажением сводить ее только к насилию и пропагандистской демагогии: любая система власти, сколь угодно репрессивная, как показывает вся человеческая история, имеет ту или иную степень легитимности и массовой поддержки. Без изощренной системы управления, без рекрутиро-

вания миллионов людей в систему власти и без легитимирующих эту власть идеологических инструментов Советский Союз вряд ли смог бы просуществовать почти 70 лет без серьезно угрожавших ему внутренних конфликтов. Вполне уместной представляется гипотеза, что идеи и институты, сформировавшиеся в советский период, в той или иной форме продолжают существовать и тем самым оказывают влияние на современное положение дел.

В то же время, хотя прошло более двух десятилетий с момента распада СССР, состояние всех постсоветских государств по-прежнему описывается как «переходный период». Сколько-нибудь устойчивое и широкое согласие относительно направления и конечной точки «перехода» не достигнуто, но сохраняется распространенное убеждение в том, что «транзит» или «реформы» заключаются в переносе в бывшие социалистические страны институтов, возникших в иных общественных условиях. «В основе большинства реформ, проводимых странами догоняющего развития, лежит идея трансплантации (заимствования) институтов из более передовой институциональной среды» (Полтерович, 2007, с. 14). Реформаторские усилия или их имитации во многих бывших коммунистических странах именно и сводятся к заимствованию норм и организационных форм у развитых капиталистических стран с демократической формой правления. В области этнокультурной политики это проявляется с не меньшей наглядностью, чем в строительстве рыночной экономики или развитии избирательной системы. В качестве внешнего образца страны бывшего СССР ориентируются главным образом на так называемые «европейские стандарты защиты национальных меньшинств».

В Европе при всех различиях между национальными моделями этнокультурной политики благодаря деятельности международных институтов (ОБСЕ, Совета Европы и Европейского Союза) и экспертных сообществ происходит постепенное формирование единых подходов и общей терминологической системы. Соответственно, этнокультурная политика в странах бывшего «реального социализма» рассматривается исследователями в течение последних 20 лет чаще всего как объект одностороннего воздействия со стороны международных организаций и стран «развитой демократии» и как сфера имплементации соответствующих европейских норм и принципов (Cirtautas and Schimmelfennig, 2010; Sasse, 2008; Schwellnus, 2005).

При этом идеологическому, интеллектуальному и, что самое важное, институциональному наследию прежнего, коммунистического режима в области этнокультурной политики (за исключением последствий русификации) в целом не уделяется много внимания. Если идеологические основы «национальной политики» в Советском Союзе были и остаются объектом научного анализа (Connor, 1984; Hirsch, 2005; Bremmer and Taras, 1997; Martin, 2001; Suny, 1993; Zaslavsky, 1988; Slezkine, 1994; Smith, 1996), то практики и инсти-

туты, в основном имевшие неформальный и закрытый характер, остаются слабо изученными. Кроме того, исследователи во многих отношениях игнорируют период конца 1980-х гг., непосредственно предшествующий распаду СССР, когда официальная «национальная политика» была наконец воплощена в законодательных актах, а обсуждение ее концептуальных основ стало публичным, подразумевающим активное участие общественности и экспертных сообществ. Логично предполагать, что идейное и институциональное влияние десятилетий, предшествующих получению государственной независимости, не может быть сброшено со счетов и должно учитываться как при исследовании современной политики защиты меньшинств, так и при разработке планов ее совершенствования.

Можно говорить о пограничном состоянии этнокультурной политики Беларуси, Молдовы и Украины в нескольких отношениях – идейном, временном, политическом и географическом. Все три страны, так или иначе будучи под воздействием советского наследия, испытывают, правда в разном масштабе, влияние европейских организаций. Молдова и Украина, но не Беларусь, являются членами Совета Европы; Молдова и Украина декларировали желание вступить в Евросоюз и прилагают в той или иной степени усилия, чтобы сблизить свое законодательство о меньшинствах и противодействии дискриминации с подходами, развиваемыми ЕС. Вместе с тем эти три страны не могут не ощущать присутствия Российской Федерации с ее внешнеполитическими амбициями, относительно развитым законодательством о национальных отношениях и широкими экспертными дискуссиями. При этом тенденции официальной российской политики в области этнокультурного разнообразия, особенно официальные декларации 2011–2013 гг.[2], по сути, подтверждают отказ от внедрения стандартов Совета Европы в области защиты меньшинств и, наоборот, реанимацию советских подходов и советской терминологии.

Наряду с вопросами о содержании и проявлениях советского наследия в современной политике этнокультурного разнообразия возникает тема совместимости или, наоборот, конфликтности этого наследия по отношению к европейским стандартам защиты меньшинств и недискриминации. Эта научная проблема до настоящего времени практически не ставилась и не обсуждалась (см.: Barany and Moser, 2005; Slater and Wilson, 2004; Kuzio, 2005; Pilkington and Popov, 2008; Suny, 1998). При этом возможные результаты ана-

[2] Доклад Государственного Совета Российской Федерации о мерах по укреплению межнационального согласия в российском обществе. 11 февраля 2011 // Министерство регионального развития Российской Федерации. 2011. 29 марта (http://minregion.ru/activities/interethnic_relations/national_policy/505/902.html); Указ Президента Российской Федерации «О стратегии государственной национальной политики Российской Федерации на период до 2025 года» № 1666 от 19 декабря 2012 г.

лиза далеки от очевидности ввиду сложности и многоплановости самих феноменов и советской «национальной политики», и современных режимов защиты меньшинств. Кроме того, остается неясным, восходят ли те или иные компоненты этнокультурной политики постсоветских государств к коммунистическому наследию или они являются порождением новых реалий государственной независимости.

Задачами данного исследования, таким образом, является анализ происхождения основных компонентов этнокультурной политики в трех странах и выявление того, в чем именно и насколько вступают в противоречие друг с другом концептуальные подходы, институциональные решения и практики, наследуемые из советского периода, заимствуемые от европейских институтов, а также носящие оригинальный характер.

Следует подчеркнуть, что идеологические и концептуальные основы прошлой и современной этнокультурной политики составляют только часть объекта нашего исследования. Нам наиболее важны институты, на которых основана политика разнообразия. Социальные институты в смысле работающих правил показывают большую устойчивость, они успешно сопротивляются идеологическим переменам, и механизмы институциональной изменчивости до сих пор представляют сложную исследовательскую задачу в социальных науках.

Влияние идеологических перемен на институты в системе государственного управления, возможность заимствования новых институтов, а также причины и следствия устойчивости старых остаются вопросами, важными не только для восточного приграничья ЕС, но и для всех бывших социалистических стран и для оценки их перспектив. Одновременно судьба институтов, предлагаемых западными, в первую очередь европейскими, межгосударственными организациями, правительственными структурами и профессиональными сообществами, в бывших социалистических странах может много дать для оценки западных, и в частности европейских, стандартов в защите меньшинств и, шире, в управлении многообразием.

Издание отражает результаты исследовательского проекта, проведенного в 2012–2013 гг. под руководством кандидата философских наук, доцента Н.Н. Беспамятных (Гродненский государственный университет им. Янки Купалы) при поддержке Центра передовых исследований и образования CASE Европейского гуманитарного университета (Вильнюс, Литовская Республика), а также Европейского центра по вопросам меньшинств (Фленсбург, Германия). Издание осуществлено при поддержке CASE. Содержание публикации отражает взгляды авторов и не обязательно совпадает с позицией издательства Европейского гуманитарного университета и Европейского центра по вопросам меньшинств.

SUMMARY

Policies of Ethno-cultural Diversity Management in Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine: between Soviet Legacies and European Standards

The volume seeks, first, to identify the kinds of ideas and institutional settings in the framework of diversity policies, which were inherited by post-Soviet countries from the communist rule and, second, to answer the questions about their compatibility with the so-called European standards of non-discrimination and minority protection. The study covers the EU Eastern Neighbourhood, i.e. Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine. The volume consists of Introduction, six chapters and Conclusion.

Introduction (by Alexander Osipov) explains the goal, objectives and the framework methodological approach of the book. The main underlying assumption of the volume is that the EU Eastern Neighbourhood is simultaneously affected by the European organizations, first and foremost the European Union, the Russian Federation with its rising geopolitical ambitions, and the region's historic legacies. The book seeks to address the first and the third components of this list. The Introduction argues that due to the convergence of the approaches to ethnic diversity issues employed by different European organizations, such as the EU, OSCE and the Council of Europe, one may conditionally acknowledge an emerging uniformity of the European external policies in this area and refer to them as 'European standards'. A study of their role in domestic ethno-cultural policies is undoubtedly important because most of the post-Soviet countries represent themselves as reformist states, i.e. nations pursuing 'reforms' while the latter are basically understood as

an import of European and North American institutions. In turn, European organizations actively promote their own standards and expertise particularly in the framework of conditionality policy. In the meantime, the Soviet Union shall be regarded as a complex institutional setting, which provided the country's internal stability for decades not exclusively by means of coercion by also with a variety of sophisticated devices of governance. One may consequently assume that these deeply embedded institutions can in partly persist and reproduce themselves after the USSR's dissolution. It is pointed out that while the Soviet nationalities policy has been sufficiently studied in terms of its ideological fundamentals and overt manifestations, its institutional design and continuities after the communism's demise remain underexplored. Nor are analysed the mutual compatibility or conflict between the newly promoted Western standards in diversity policies and institutional legacies of the past.

Chapter 1 '*Ethno-cultural diversity management: conceptualization of the research issue, methodology and levels of analysis*' (by Mikalai Biaspamiatnykh and Alexander Osipov) explains the terminology and methodological underpinnings of the study. The authors follow the social constructionist paradigm and regard ethnic or similar differentiations as categorizations, which do not exist as something given, but rather appear and manifest themselves in durable social interactions.

Currently almost all human societies is terms of individual countries' populations regarded as heterogeneous, and linguistic or cultural homogeneity is not championed as a social ideal any longer. However, there is no universal or widely accepted – either practical or theoretical – understanding of what diversity is. One may say that a common feature of almost all approaches to the description of social heterogeneity is doing this through the category of 'group'. In other words, diversity is usually understood (explicitly or tacitly) as the co-existence of different human collectives (peoples, minorities, races or nations), and this implies the existence of inter-group boundaries, individual affiliations with groups and intra-group cohesion. In practical terms, racial, ethnic, national, and linguistic categorizations are applied in changeable meanings, which are dependent on the given social context and the country or geographic region. Correspondingly, domestic policies are affected by the mainstream interpretations of how diversity should look like.

In the thematic area in question, it is important to draw a distinction between practical and analytical categories. The former are used by policy-makers and other actors directly involved in the process; the latter are employed by external observers and analysts who are ideally supposed to distance themselves from the vocabulary of the observed social environment. The main difference between the two categories is that while scholars are in principle able to agree on a certain

terms' meaning and on the modes and limits of its application; to the contrary, one cannot mediate and manage the meanings of practical categories. This is mainly because the latter reflect relations of power and authority, and are overloaded with implications dependent upon a particular context.

The theoretical framework for the study is neo-institutionalism in its chronologically most recent version known as 'discursive institutionalism'. Neo-institutionalism shall be regarded as a trend in modern social theory rather than a comprehensive theory. Neo-institutionalism's major difference from the 'old' institutionalism is that the former addresses 'institutions' as durable social rules, which create actors as well as their incentives, while 'old' institutionalism interprets institutions predominantly as organisational frameworks, which set up constraints to social actors with their interests taken as given. Neo-institutionalism provides a good tool for the explanation of institutional stability and continuity; it also opens way to the analysis of institutional isomorphism, or, in other words, a transfer of institutions to other environments or a creation of similar institutions in different social frameworks. Neo-institutionalism's general weakness is its insufficiency for the explanation of institutional change in a way other than referring to exogenous influences. The recent currents of neo-institutionalism, namely 'sociological' and 'discursive' institutionalisms – strive to overcome this deficiency by drawing the causes of change from cultural and discursive patterns of the given societies. Since the given study addresses competition of ideas and their role in societal transformations, the latter framework – discursive institutionalism – is used as the major theoretic framework.

In the given thematic area, as the authors argue, it is also important to note the difference between so-called instrumental and symbolic policies. There is no clear boundary between the types; the principal distinction is that instrumental policy directly concerns the distribution of power and wealth in a given society, while symbolic policies produce interpretations and descriptions of those relations. In this respect, transformation and circulation of ideas are regarded as part and parcel of the political institutionalisation of ethnic heterogeneity as long as they cause or generate durable rules of social interaction. Another phenomenon, which is to be taken into account, is the so-called 'systemic hypocrisy' (the term coined by Nils Brunsson, i.e. the discrepancy between self-representation and action of an organisation).

The authors offer a definition of 'legacy' and strictly follow the approach proposed by Jason Wittenberg: there must be at least two periods compared; the phenomenon in the latter period must be the same that occurred in the prior period, and the phenomenon must have been carried over from the past rather than merely replicated. The given research focuses are on institutional legacies in diversity policies, i.e. durable rules and modes of interaction persistent in the domains both of symbolic and instrumental policies.

Chapter 2 '*Ethno-cultural diversity and its management: from theory to practical models*' (by Mikalai Biaspamiatnykh and Alexander Osipov) addresses the study's subject. Diversity management can be defined as a policy deliberately aimed at shaping and regulating social relations pertinent to the ethnic, cultural or racial heterogeneity of the society. It must be regarded thus as an artificial intellectual construct, an analytical tool, or an ideal type introduced to encompass politics with certain common features. There is no single or commonly accepted understanding what diversity management is about and no standard terminology.

Activities, which can be conventionally called diversity management vary in purposes, scope, form and content; the issues, important for one country, might be perceived as irrelevant for another one. The decisive factor is the agendas which the ruling elites recognise and which are eventually dependent on the given country's demographic composition, migration patterns, international relations, economic situation, political institutions and other circumstances. 'Diversity' can imply different attitudes towards heterogeneity as a problem or asset and may be subject to the idea of creating a culturally homogeneous society or to the maintenance or differences. Diversity management in certain countries may rest on different values and aspirations, which include or exclude certain areas of social relations and public management.

There are no theories or comprehensive normative models of diversity management. A correct manner in which to bring the existing approaches in the system together is to do it through the notion of 'frame', which refers to an angle for the viewing and contextualization of certain phenomena or the perspective to identify and set up an agenda. One can conditionally single out several frames within diversity management, and the major ones can be named as minority protection, non-discrimination, multiculturalism and compound statehood. They are also other ways to label and discursively organize diversity policies, and they rest on eclectic or fuzzy approaches.

Minority protection implies that the society in question can be divided into several distinct groups, which exist in a state of asymmetric relations with each other. Historically, the concept of national or ethnic minorities is derived from the idea of nation-state; 'minorities' are in some way juxtaposed to 'nation' or 'majority', which constitutes the fundamental of the state. The notion of 'minorities', when taken as an analytical tool, generates problems. As a descriptive model, it is supposed to reflect and lump together at least three completely different types of social relations, these being ethnic or similar categorization and statistics, power and wealth distribution and internal group cohesion and solidarity, which rarely go hand in hand. As a practical category, 'minority' often serves as an instrument of power. Minorities are those whome the government allows to be minorities; those who are not recognised as such (for example, because they are allegedly

recent migrants) are frequently denied the right to make certain claims. Methods of 'minority' categorisation are always a problem; it is never possible to completely disaggregate a given society into groups with fixed memberships and boundaries.

The idea of 'minority' nevertheless remains very popular all over the world, because it is already institutionalized in legal and political mechanisms and because it complies with some common sense assumptions. According to the dominant contemporary approach, minority protection is comprised of three components; namely, that of safeguarding equal rights, the protection and promotion of culture and participation in public life.

The prevention and elimination of discrimination concerns many social categories, such as those based on gender, age or sexual orientation, along with those based on ethnicity or related grounds. Most interpretations of discrimination can be summarized as distinctions made between people on certain grounds without justifiable reasons. Yet, not every perspective involving an element of differentiation between people implies discrimination, and at times the identical treatment of individuals who find themselves in substantively different positions can be treated as certain cases of discrimination. Direct discrimination occurs when individuals or organizations are treated differently due to belonging to different social categories; for example, to different ethnic or racial groups. The term 'indirect discrimination' denotes a rule, practice or requirement that is facially neutral with regard to a certain characteristic, but that may in fact disadvantage people possessing the characteristic in question.

There is a ban on discrimination enshrined in international human rights law, in EU community law and in legislation across Europe, yet their application certainly varies greatly across nation-states and within the wider international community. The social sciences additionally offer a broader and looser interpretation based on the idea of restricted access to resources for certain groups. Non-discrimination is very important for diversity politics and policies not only because it generates certain legal instruments but also for reasons that it sets up certain public agendas and guides public discourses.

'Multiculturalism', the notion, which pioneered recent policymaking efforts and debates on the accommodation of ethnic diversity, can mean different things to different people, such as a political programme, an official slogan, or a normative theory of ethno-cultural pluralism. A common element for all these kinds is rejection of the ethno-cultural homogeneity of a society in question as an ideal and implies the recognition of ethno-cultural diversity as an asset for social and political development. In most of its varieties, multiculturalism emphasizes 'culture' as the essence of inter-group differences, which are to be accommodated; it avoids explicit symbolic hierarchies of ethnicities and stresses the equal value of all 'cultures' and offers public support to cultural pluralism. A covert meaning of

'multiculturalism' is often drawing ethnic relations out of the political domain and camouflaging the issues of social inequality and exclusion.

'Compound statehood' may be used for the addressing of ideas and policy devices resting upon the perception of ethnic categories as political entities and component parts of the statehood in question. Political systems based upon the recognition of several constituent groups (ethnic or otherwise) themselves may fall apart into kinds of either federalism or consociationalism or power-sharing, whether the constituent entities of the state may be territorially defined or not.

The authors point out that the topic of diversity management requires making use of a few related disciplinary outlooks and can be better grasped through synergies between political science, law and sociology.

Chapter 3 '*Diversity policies in the Borderland: competing models*' (by Alexander Osipov) addresses different historic and ideological strands in the diversity policies within the region in question. The chapter outlines first the specificity of Eastern Europe at large and the Neighbourhood in particular. The statehoods, which were existent in this region, had complex and heterogeneous populations, and 'nation' was conceptualised and perceived as entities based on kinship, language and culture, but not on common citizenship or civic solidarity. From an ethno-nationalist point of view, ancestors of the current populations in all three countries of the Neighbourhood for centuries lived in the states, which they could not regard as 'their own' in national or ethnic terms. Lasting 'nation-statehoods' of a specific type were established in Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine only under the Soviet rule. Following this line, the newly independent countries have defined themselves as states on an ethno-national basis. The conceptual framework, used by most scholars to describe the current state of affairs, was offered in early 1990s by Rogers Brubaker and is referred to as, first, 'nationalising state' or a state doing nation-building on an ethno-nationalist grounds, and, second, as 'triadic nexus', i.e. relations between 'nationalising states', minorities and the external 'kin-states', which back their 'kin-minorities'. These two inter-related theories were a good point of departure for the studies of ethnic relations in Eastern Europe, but later on they proved to be partly adequate. Recent empiric research has demonstrated inconsistencies between different component of nation-building in individual states, discrepancies between discourses and practices and the underestimated role of international organizations. However, if these new elements are taken into account, the concept of 'nationalising state' may be employed as a useful analytical tool.

The Soviet nationalities policy is overviewed in the respective sub-chapter as a part of broader social engineering, which was resting not only on violence or direct coercion, but also on hegemony (in Gramscian sense). Among the important features of the Soviet domestic policies were the domination of informal institutional and the discrepancies between representations and actions of the ruling

apparatus. The 'nationalities policy' was subject to the goals of social and economic development, resource mobilization and for this purpose levelling the social, economic and cultural conditions of different regions and groups. The 'nationalities policy' was a sophisticated and flexible setting, which incorporated territorialisation of ethnicity (and even ethno-nationalism as a founding principle of the constituent state units), promotion of social equality, discursive and institutional recognition of ethnic and cultural pluralism and guided social mobility of different ethnicities through institutionalization of individual ethnic affiliations. In late 1980s, during the liberalisation period, this complex system was supplemented with orchestrated bottom-up mobilisation of ethno-cultural movements. Since the Soviet nationalities policy was a durable and effective system, its lasting effects and legacies must be taken into consideration.

Unlike the Soviet normative and institutional framework, European intergovernmental organizations and their diversity-related approaches are relatively recent creatures. The author argues that one can question the very notion of 'European minority standards', since the existing normative provisions in many respects lack clarity, leave the governments with too broad margins of appreciation, the scope and content of both rights and positive obligations remain vague and open to interpretations; rather one can talk about 'principles' and approaches. However, although a convergence in European organizations' approaches to ethnic diversity is taking place and the emerging normative base is gradually gaining more consistency, one can conventionally talk about 'European standards' with some reservations. The organizations in questions are the Council of Europe (CoE) with its legally binding treaties, which concern minorities (these are the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages); the OSCE with its institution of the High Commissioner on National Minorities and a variety of political commitments and recommendations and the European Union. The latter develops its own anti-discrimination normative framework and also exports its anti-discrimination model and minority-related standards of the CoE and the OSCE eastwards. The latter is achieved by the application of the so-called conditionality principle in course of the EU enlargement (Copenhagen criteria) as well as the EU neighbourhood policy, which affects Moldova and Ukraine, but not Belarus. Although external pressures and persuasion practiced by all the three European organization, have a significant impact in the behaviour and rhetoric of the governments in the former communist countries, the international institutions have shown flexibility, inconsistency and even double standards with regard to minority protection, particularly in the approaches practiced by the EU monitoring bodies.

Chapter 4 '*The ethno-cultural diversity of Belarus as an object of politics*' (by Ihar Pushkin and Alexander Osipov) starts with emphasizing the fact that Belarus

significantly differs from other countries of the region in terms of its political regime and economic model. While the former is described as authoritarian, the later is characterized by state regulation and social paternalism. In the meantime, Belarus by its ethnic structure largely resembles other countries of the region. Ethnic relations in the country demonstrate stability and lack of significant conflicts on ethnic, racial, linguistic or confessional grounds.

The chapter retrospectively analyses the dynamics and main trends of the Belarusian ethno-cultural policies on the country's way from being a part of the USSR to independent statehood. The primary attention is paid to the authorities' attitudes towards the status of the titular language and the general conceptual organizations of the nationhood. It is followed by the analysis of the conceptual and organizational framework of the ethno-cultural policies, and the authors scrutinize the Belarusian legislation on ethno-cultural issues, official attitudes, doctrines, concepts and structures responsible for ethno-cultural policies.

The authors argue that Belarusian authorities and the society at large, like in every other country of the former USSR, lack understanding of how social equality protected by law and non-discrimination shall be interpreted. Moreover, it is characterized by the constant mixing of the problem of equality and hatred on ethnic or religious grounds. The authors conclude that, on the one hand, Belarusian authorities recognize ethnic fundamental of the state, and this results in the policies aimed to support compatriots abroad; on the other hand, the state constantly emphasizes the civic nature of Belarusian society as well as equality of individuals regardless of their ethnic belonging and thus stresses the importance of civic but not ethno-cultural loyalty of its citizens. With regard to the linguistic issue, the authors outline that the government regards the language policy and the actual situation of official Belarusian-Russian bilingualism beyond the context of ethno-cultural policies. Minority-related practical policies in the areas of education, mass-media, cultural production are characterized with loose normative frameworks and wide margins of discretion enjoyed by the executive authorities. The relations between governmental bodies and ethno-cultural organizations are embodied in advisory structures at the state bodies; the government sets up the agendas and defines the framework and contents of these policies while the role of minorities remains merely passive.

Belarus has developed its legal and policy framework for ethno-cultural policy beyond the scope of the Council of Europe. The Belarusian model of the ethno-cultural policies has not been also affected by the EU, and the OSCE involvement did not directly concern this sphere. In the meantime, the Belarusian legal framework and policies was developing in parallel with the pan-European norms in this area. The Belarusian ideological and legal fundamentals of ethno-cultural policies have many similarities with the approaches practices by the Council of Europe and in their most part can be deemed as compatible with the Council of Europe's

standards. At the same time, as authors emphasize, one of the main problems of the Belarusian society is linked with the general political climate in Belarus. This largely concerns freedom of the country's civic society, which is seen as one of the main principles of the minority policies in Europe.

Chapter 5 '*Ethno-cultural policies in Moldova*' (by Federica Prina and Alexander Osipov) provides an overview of diversity management in the smallest and least stable of the three Neighborhood countries. Moldova represents the most complicated case, because of the Gagauzian territorial autonomy and the frozen conflict in Transnistria; at the same time the country pioneers implementation of the European norms into domestic legislation in the Neighborhood. Furthermore, it is the only country out of three, where the titular ethnicity faces the rivalry of two national projects – Moldovan and Romanian.

The chapter outlines dynamics and major characteristics of ethno-cultural policies of Moldova prior and after the collapse of the USSR, tracing back the developments in the country and its relations with the regions of Gagauzia and Transnistria, as well as four major periods of the country's post-Soviet development. While depicting conceptual and organizational frameworks of Moldovan ethno-cultural policies, the authors analyze the development of the domestic and international legal frameworks, the official terminologies and doctrines as well as official bodies responsible for their implementation. The authors point out that the insufficient implementation of the minority legislation, international obligations and governmental programmes still poses a problem. This situation results from three key circumstances – lack of clarity in legislation provisions, lack of political will and lack of resources. Moreover, the minority-related legislation is often characterized as merely declarative and missing mechanisms of implementation. The authors explain the peculiarities of statuses of languages in the country, their role in education and media. At the same time, they underline the politicization of the language issue, which has dominated Moldovan policies since late 1980s. While addressing the issues of discrimination, social exclusion and hatred, they consider the development of the domestic legislation in this sphere, including the 2012 anti-discrimination law, which represents the case of transposition of the EU anti-discrimination norms. This section is followed by the ones focused on the Roma minority and on minorities' participation in the public services and local authorities. The chapter also contains analysis of two special cases – the one of Gagauzia and the one of Transnistria.

The authors conclude that the Soviet legacy has significantly influenced the institutional foundations of the Moldovan ethno-cultural policies, which aim at affirming the existence of the independent Moldovan nation and at the simultaneous recognition of multiethnic and multilingual nature of the state. Moreover, as it is underlined, all the conflicts with regard to language or ethnicity were inherited by

Moldova from its Soviet past when the foundations for the current laws, structures and strategies were adopted and when the autonomous territories emerged. The same trend can be observed in the language use where the language policies merely secure the co-existence of the titular and Russian language while marginalizing the role of other languages. As for the configuration of state-minority relations, the authors stress that the state is trying to impose its own agenda on minorities while the provisions on minority participation in the state bodies have merely declarative character. The main critics of the European organizations are focused not on the Soviet-shaped legislation but on its actual implementation practices. Nevertheless, the adoption of the anti-discrimination law shows that the European approaches can be in principle incorporated into Moldovan legislation. However, as the authors stress, the existing status quo is merely a result of compromises when none of the domestic actors can impose its will to another one and the Soviet-formed institutions and practices secure the framework for this compromise.

Chapter 6 '*Diversity policies in Ukraine*' (by Hanna Vasilevich) addresses the peculiarities of ethno-cultural policies in the biggest country of the Neighborhood. The chapter starts with the description of the ethno-cultural policies' development since the Russian imperial rule of the Ukrainian state- and nation-building under the Soviets. The historic overview is followed by the analysis of the dynamics and main trends of the country's ethno-cultural policies, particularly with regard to the statuses and attitudes towards Ukrainian and Russian languages after the independence. The author stresses that the nation-building in Ukraine is characterized by the blurred language borders between Ukrainian and Russian languages, and thus by wide presence of Russian language in all areas of public life despite the existing legislation, which secures the status of Ukrainian as the sole state language in the country.

Moreover, the nationalization policies are often publicly represented presented as the 'European' or 'civilization' choice. A large part of the chapter focused on the conceptual and organization framework of ethno-cultural policies in Ukraine, first and foremost, on their normative basis and on the state structures in charge of its implementation. The chapter shows that a large part of the existing ideological frameworks, structures and attitudes were basically inherited from Ukraine's Soviet past. While discussing the main spheres and dimensions of practical activities, the author addresses the issues of language policies, education, media and culture. It is followed by the issues of anti-discrimination, social exclusion and ethnic hatred. While discussing the issues of equality and non-discrimination, the author refers to the anti-discrimination law, which similarly as in Moldova can be seen as an example of the European approaches' incorporation into domestic legislation. This part is followed by the analysis of national minorities' participation in public life and decision-making, relations of the state with the organizations of national

minorities and the integration of the Roma national minority into the Ukrainian society. As the author concludes, the latter issue also provides an example of how European approaches can be incorporated into the domestic law of the country in the EU Eastern Neighbourhood.

A sub-chapter is devoted to the Crimean peninsula and addresses two issues – the region's territorial autonomy and the rehabilitation of the deported people. The first issue is considered retrospectively with a reference to the Crimean autonomy during the region's 'pre-Ukrainian' period and its restoration and development in 1990s. The second issue deals with the rehabilitation and status of the deported nationalities of the Crimea with the focus made on the Crimean Tatars, their self-organization and participation in the political and social life of the region and Ukraine at large. The author concludes that the main elements of the ethno-cultural policies of Ukraine trace back to 1980-90s when the most of the relevant legal acts were adopted, and configuration of the contemporary state-minorities relations was set up. They were based on the Soviet legal doctrines, which were embodied into formulations and declarative character of these documents, often inconsistent with each other. Starting from 2000s, some changes in the Ukrainian legislation can be observed as a result of the signing of the FCNM and the ECRML. This 'Europeanization' trend was followed by the harmonization of the Ukrainian legislation with the EU laws, which can be observed in case of anti-discrimination law. However, the adoption of this document cannot be seen as the product of the Ukrainian legislation's evolution, but merely as a result of the EU's conditionality policy. The author resumes that the Ukrainian ethno-cultural policies still have declaratory nature while this issue attracts quite an insignificant attention from the state.

Conclusion (by Alexander Osipov) summarises the research findings. The study reveals numerous parallels in the Soviet conceptual and discursive organisation of nationalities policy and diversity management in the Neighbourhood. In both frameworks the statehood rests on ethno-nationalist principle and in both cases the governments and law-makers acknowledge cultural and ethnic pluralism. Generally, one can talk about unbroken existence of the key concepts determining diversity policies during and after the communist rule. These are interpretations of human equality on ethnic grounds; understandings of the social role of individual ethnicity; interpretations of the notion of 'culture'; the ways individual equality is reconciled with ethnicity-based statehood, interpretations of group rights and autonomy. Noteworthy are the remnants of the Soviet-type individual 'passport' ethnicity in all the three countries; territorial autonomies with a distinct ethnic and linguistic profile in Moldova and Ukraine; the continuity of the official approach of the late 1980s to what 'rehabilitation' of the formerly deported peoples' must mean in Ukraine; and the persistence of that configuration of language policy, which was introduced in 1989-90 and included the language of the 'titular'

ethnicity as the only state language, Russian as the 'language of inter-ethnic communication' and minority languages.

Institutionally one can point out the continuity of the major institutional settings including the major techniques of government, such as 'fuzzy legality'; the prevalence of informal institutions and their symbiosis with the formal ones; systemic discrepancies between symbolic and instrumental policies; co-optation of minority spokespersons into the system of governance; mobilization and channelling of public activities on ethnic grounds into the cultural domain; understanding of social equality as predominantly suppression of encroachments on the political stability.

The author concludes that in the case of the former Soviet Union the major achievements of its 'nationalities policy' still exist. In fact, the current diversity policies in the Neighbourhood countries (as well as in all other post-communist states) serve as a device for channelling potentially destabilising activities in a safe direction and for generating socially acceptable common agendas and narratives. Although, all the three countries of the Neighbourhood are lacking certain founding mythologies and values, which would be acceptable to all ethnic, linguistic and territorial segments of their populaces, the flexible systems of informal regulations and 'systemic hypocrisies' of the public authorities allow for keeping hegemonic control over the societies and for striking the balance between the potentially antagonist groups. The volume's authors have bracketed out the broader issues of the post-communist 'hybrid' regimes nature and perspectives for their transformation and survival, but the relative stability over the last 20 years and the lack of deadly internal conflicts support the conclusion about the viability of these governance systems.

The study has also shown that the major frames of diversity policies employed by the European institutions resemble the basics of the Soviet approach to the 'nationalities question'. The European institutions acknowledge a wide discretion of the governments in the implementation of the international commitments and obligations and do not offer any firm and clear evaluation criteria. As the international monitoring reports reveal, the disagreements between the European organizations and the national governments are of quantitative, but not qualitative nature. The international monitoring bodies criticise most salient manifestations of 'systemic hypocrisy' and call for more allocations for ethnic minorities, but not touch upon the existing normative and institutional frameworks of minority governance and language policies. Therefore, one can acknowledge the lack of conflict between the communist legacies in diversity policies and the application of the European approaches to minority protection. The only genuinely new element in the national systems of diversity management is the new anti-discrimination laws adopted in 2012 in Moldova and Ukraine under the EU's pressure, but it would be too premature to make conclusions about their viability and efficiency.